

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 3, 6, 14-17, 26, and 27 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-7, and 9-27 are pending and under consideration.

Objection to Claim 3

The Office Action objects to claim 3 because there is insufficient antecedent support for the phrase "the power supply leading in-terminal." Applicants amend claim 3 to obviate this objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 26 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Office Action rejects claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,088,244 issued to Shioya et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Shioya").

Shioya does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a power supply controlling unit outputting a control signal to the pulse width modulator unit to control the first switching unit to perform an on/off operation corresponding to a power on/off signal received from a host computer connected through a USB interface unit and outputting a trigger signal indicative thereof," as recited in claim 26.

Item 6 of the Office Action implies that Shioya does not teach this feature. Therefore, for at least this reason, claim 26 patentably distinguishes over the cited reference. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 1, 4-7, 9, 10, and 13-25 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4-7, 9, 10, and 13-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shioya in view of U.S. Patent 6,801,730 issued to Johnson. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Shioya and Johnson, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a power supply switch selecting power on/off signal in response to a power on/off signal received from a host computer connected through the USB interface unit and outputting a trigger signal indicative thereof," as recited in claim 1.

As indicated in item 6 of the Office Action, Shioya does not disclose, teach, or suggest a USB interface unit. Therefore, the Office Action asserts, "Johnson teaches using a USB interface unit to communicate between a computer and printer in order to manage power consumption of the system."

However, as indicated in col. 1, line 60 through col. 2, line 2, col. 3, lines 1-41, and Figure 1 of Johnson, a calendar with a schedule may be downloaded to a memory 30, and a

controller 20 may be configured to manage power according to the downloader calendar.

Johnson does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “a power supply switch selecting a power on/off signal in response to a power on/off signal received from a host computer connected through the USB interface unit and outputting a trigger signal indicative thereof,” as recited in claim 1. Johnson does not disclose, teach, or suggest receiving a power on/off signal from the host computer to output a trigger signal. Johnson manages power based on a calendar stored in a memory instead of a power on/off signal from a host computer and a trigger signal. Because Johnson’s controller 20 is configured to manage power according to a downloaded calendar, Johnson does not disclose the “power supply switch” of claim 1. Therefore, Johnson cannot teach or suggest using a USB interface unit to provide a power on/off signal, and cannot teach outputting a trigger signal indicative thereof. Therefore, Johnson offers no motivation to apply a Universal Serial Bus (USB) to Shioya.

As discussed above, Shioya does not even mention a USB Interface unit in its circuitry or the downloading of a calendar to a memory to manage power. Instead, Shioya’s switching power supply and Johnson’s power management system are different systems. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Shioya fails to supply any motivation to combine Shioya and Johnson. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 4, 5, and 25 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 4, 5, and 25 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Similarly, Shioya and Johnson, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “a power supply controlling unit outputting a control signal to the pulse width modulating unit to control the first switching unit to perform an on/off operation corresponding to the power on/off signal from the user or from a host computer by way of a USB interface unit,” as recited in claim 6.

Claims 7-10 depend from claim 6 and include all of the features of claim 6. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 7-10 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Similarly, Shioya and Johnson, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “the signal processing unit receives a power-on signal from the host computer through the USB interface unit or from the power supply switch,” as recited in claim 14.

Claims 15-24 depend from claim 14 and include all of the features of claim 14. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 15 –24 patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Rejection of Claims 3, 11, and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 3, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoiya in view of Johnson and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,407,734 issued to Komine. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Komine does not cure the deficiencies of Shoiya and Johnson.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 3 is also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 6 and include all of the features of claim 6. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 6 is also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 27 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoiya in view of U.S. Patent 5,835,136 issued to Watanabe et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Watanabe").

Watanabe does not cure the deficiencies of Shoiya. Claim 27 depends from claim 26 and includes all of the features of claim 26. Therefore, for at least these reasons claim 26 patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Summary

Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-27 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/619,604

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: September 14, 2005 By: Paul F. Daebeler
Paul F. Daebeler
Registration No. 35,852

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501